

DOE has conducted a survey of the forested lands within the SRS waste management area and determined that there are no threatened or endangered species or critical habitats on this land. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service have concurred in DOE's determination.

Mitigation

Based upon the above discussion, DOE believes that all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the moderate treatment alternative have already been adopted. DOE believes that all appropriate mitigation measures are included in the moderate treatment alternative.

There are 12 archaeological sites within the SRS waste management facility boundary that may be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Potential impacts to these sites will be achieved by avoiding them, if possible. If avoidance is not possible, there will be an archaeological excavation of the sites before any land clearing begins. Mitigation will be conducted in consultation with the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office.

Conclusion

DOE has determined that the most appropriate method of managing low-level radioactive, hazardous, mixed, and transuranic wastes at SRS, considering all relevant factors, is to implement the moderate treatment configuration alternative. These factors include beneficial and adverse environmental impacts, monetary costs, and regulatory commitments.

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 22, 1995.

Richard J. Guimond,
Assistant Surgeon General, USPHS, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, for Environmental Management.

[FR Doc. 95-26845 Filed 10-27-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP95-700-000]

Williams Natural Gas Company; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Springfield Loop Project and Request for Comments on Environmental Issues

October 24, 1995.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) will prepare an environmental assessment (EA) that will

discuss the environmental impacts of the construction and operation of the facilities proposed in the Springfield Loop Project.¹ This EA will be used by the Commission in its decision-making process to determine whether an environmental impact statement is necessary and whether to approve the project.

Summary of the Proposed Project

Williams Natural Gas Company (Williams) wants to extend its Springfield loop line by constructing about 28.2 miles of 20-inch-diameter pipeline in Newton, Lawrence, and Christian Counties, Missouri.

Williams' wants to complete construction of this project prior to November 1, 1996.

The general location of the project facilities is shown in appendix 1.²

Land Requirements for Construction

Construction of the proposed facilities would disturb about 342 acres of land. Most of the proposed 100-foot-wide pipeline construction right-of-way (ROW) would overlap the ROW of Williams' existing 16-inch-diameter pipeline ROW by 41 feet as the new pipeline would be installed with a 25-foot offset from the existing 16-inch-diameter pipeline. However, in order to avoid housing, landforms, and development, Williams would construct 13 segments totalling about 2.8 miles with an offset from the existing 16-inch-diameter pipeline that is greater than 25 feet. About 216 acres of undisturbed land and 126 acres of previously disturbed land would be affected by construction of this project.

The EA Process

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from an action whenever it considers the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. NEPA also requires us to discover and address concerns the public may have about proposals. We call this "scoping." The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EA on the important environmental issues. By this Notice of

¹ Williams Natural Gas Company's application was filed with the Commission under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations.

² The appendices referenced in this notice are not being printed in the Federal Register. Copies are available from the Commission's Public Reference and Files Maintenance Branch, Room 3104, 941 North Capitol Street, NW, Washington, DC 20426, or call (202) 208-1371. Copies of the appendices were sent to all those receiving this notice in the mail.

Intent, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of the issues it will address in the EA. All comments received are considered during the preparation of the EA. State and local government representatives are encouraged to notify their constituents of this proposed action and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

The EA will discuss impacts that could occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed project under these general headings:

- Geology and soils
- Water resources, fisheries, and wetlands
- Vegetation and wildlife
- Endangered and threatened species
- Public safety
- Land use
- Cultural resources
- Air quality and noise
- Hazardous waste

We will also evaluate possible alternatives to the proposed project or portions of the project, and make recommendations on how to lessen or avoid impacts on the various resource areas.

Our independent analysis of the issues will be in the EA. Depending on the comments received during the scoping process, the EA may be published and mailed to Federal, state, and local agencies, public interest groups, interested individuals, affected landowners, newspapers, libraries, and the Commission's official service list for this proceeding. A comment period will be allotted for review if the EA is published. We will consider all comments on the EA before we recommend that the Commission approve or not approve the project.

Currently Identified Environmental Issues

We have already identified issues that we think deserve attention based on a preliminary review of the proposed facilities and the environmental information provided by Williams:

- The proposed project would require a 100-foot-wide ROW.
- The proposed project would cross one perennial stream that is greater than 100 feet in width.
- The Springfield Loop Project may affect about 12 wetlands in the project area.

Keep in mind that these are preliminary issues. Issues may be added, subtracted, or changed based on your comments and our analysis.

Public Participation

You can make a difference by sending a letter addressing you specific

comments or concerns about the project. You should focus on the potential environmental effects of the proposal, alternatives to the proposal (including alternative routes), and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impact. The more specific your comments, the more useful they will be. Please follow the instructions below to ensure that your comments are received and properly recorded:

- Address your letter to: Lois Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol St., NE, Washington, DC 20426;
- Reference Docket No. CP95-700-000;
- Send a *copy* of your letter to: Ms. Jennifer Goggin, EA Project Manager, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol St., NE, Room 7312, Washington, DC 20426; and
- Mail your comments so that they will be received in Washington, DC on or before November 24, 1995.

If you wish to receive a copy of the EA, you should request one from Ms. Goggin at the above address.

Becoming an Intervenor

In addition to involvement in the EA scoping process, you may want to become an official party to the proceeding or become an "intervenor". Among other things, intervenors have the right to receive copies of case-related Commission documents and filings by other intervenors. Likewise, each intervenor must provide copies of its filings to all other parties. If you want to become an intervenor you must file a motion to intervene according to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214) (see appendix 2).

The date for filing timely motions to intervene has passed. Parties seeking to file later interventions must show good cause, as required by section 385.214(b)(3), why this time limitation should be waived. Environmental issues have been viewed as good cause for later intervention. You do not need intervenor status to have your scoping comments considered.

Additional information about the proposed project is available from Ms. Jennifer Goggin, EA Project Manager, at (202) 208-2226.

Lois D. Cashell,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-26784 Filed 10-27-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. ES93-43-007]

Citizens Utilities Company; Notice of Amended Application

October 24, 1995.

Take notice that on October 20, 1995, Citizens Utilities Company (Citizens Utilities) filed an amendment to its application in Docket No. ES93-43-000 *et al.*

By letter orders dated September 7, 1993 (64 FERC ¶ 62,167) and November 2, 1993 (65 FERC ¶ 62,111), Citizens Utilities was authorized, in Docket No. ES93-43-000 *et al.* to issue not more than:

- (a) \$1.25 billion principal amount of unsecured promissory notes outstanding at any one time;
- (b) \$750 million aggregate principal amount of longer term debt securities with a final maturity or maturities of not less than 9 months nor more than 50 years; and
- (c) 25 million shares of Common Stock of Citizens Utilities (subject to adjustment for stock splits, stock dividends, recapitalizations and similar changes after the date of the application, including an adjustment to 50 million shares of common stock as a result of an announced 2 for 1 stock split) and \$300 million liquidation value of preferred stock of Citizens Utilities, subject to an overall limitation of \$500 million for the aggregate of the proceeds of the issuance of Common and Preferred Stock.

The aggregate amount outstanding at any one time of the securities issued under (a), (b) and (c) was limited to \$1.25 billion.

Citizens Utilities requests that the authorization granted in Docket No. ES93-43-000 *et al.* be amended to authorize Citizens to issue up to \$800 million of debt securities in lieu of \$750 million without changing the aggregate \$1.25 billion authorization.

Citizens requests the amendment because it does not have sufficient unused borrowing authority to issue up to \$213 million of convertible debentures for which authorization is pending before the Commission in Docket No. ES93-43-006.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426 in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before October 31, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party

must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-26795 Filed 10-27-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. ES85-5-002]

El Paso Electric Company; Notice of Amended Application

October 24, 1995.

Take notice that on October 20, 1995, El Paso Electric Company (El Paso) made a filing requesting that the Commission amend the authorization granted in Docket No. ES85-5-000.

By letter order dated November 27, 1984 (29 FERC ¶ 62,270), El Paso was authorized:

(A) To assume liability for the payment of not more than \$150 million of pollution control refunding bonds (PCRB) to be issued by the Maricopa County, Arizona Pollution Control Corporation (the "Authority") for the purpose of financing the costs to El Paso of the acquisition and construction of pollution control facilities at the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station in Maricopa, Arizona, including the refunding of outstanding short-term pollution control bonds theretofore issued on behalf of El Paso by the Authority;

(B) To issue second mortgage bonds in principal amount equal to the principal amount of pollution control bonds to be issued by the Authority, such second mortgage bonds to be issued as collateral security for El Paso's obligation of payment of such pollution control bonds; and

(C) To take all such action and execute and deliver all such instruments, documents, agreements and indentures as shall be necessary or appropriate in order to consummate the financing.

In original application contemplated that, as a condition to the issuance and sale of the PCRBs, a national banking association would be required to issue and deliver to the Trustee of the PCRBs, an irrevocable letter of credit as a financial support facility for El Paso's payment obligation under the PCRBs. Pursuant to the Commission's Order, Credit Suisse issued a letter of credit in support of the issuance of \$37,100,000 of the PCRBs. The letter of credit is due to expire on December 21, 1995.

In its October 20, 1995 amendment, El Paso requests authorization to enter into extensions of the existing letter of credit